REMARKS

Applicant has cancelled all of the originally filed claims 18-33, inclusive. New claims 34-53, inclusive, have been added to better encompass the full scope and breadth of the invention notwithstanding Applicant's belief that the claims would have been allowable as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that no claims have been narrowed within the meaning of *Festo*.

I.   Pro Se Request For Constructive Assistance

If, for any reason the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP §707.07(j) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

II.   Rejection of Claims 18-22, 30-33 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticpated by Greer

Claims 18-22, 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Greer, et al. (Reference C) U.S. Patent 5,978,828. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Examiner references Greer (col. 7, lines 51-67) with respect to the first recited step of Claim 18, "ascertaining at a time that an unpublished identifier can potentially correspond to a network resource having information that is scheduled to be publicly released after said time, wherein said unpublished identifier does not correspond to said network resource at said time". The Greer (col. 7, lines 51-67) reference reads, "Once a Web page has been downloaded and stored or cached on a client electronic system, a user may tag the Web page for obtaining update information. This may be done by, for example, selecting a menu item in the client (e.g., enhanced browser 100 of FIG. 2) called "updates". Once the menu item is selected, a window such as the setup window 600 of FIG. 9 is displayed", and further reads, "The user may request the client to obtain update information on log on (e.g., by selecting the enable box 640), manually (e.g., by selecting the manual update field 642), or periodically (e.g., every fifth log-on, beginning of the month, etc.)."

The problem with Greer is that the setup window configuration is based upon a known web page having a known URL whereas Applicant teaches configuration when an identifier such as a URL is not yet known at the time of configuration.

CLAIM 20

Claim 20 is similar in rationale to canceled Claim 4. Examiner references Greer (col. 4, lines 3-6) with respect to Claim 20 and canceled Claim 4, "wherein said generation method includes the step of generating said starting time from the identifier". The Greer (col. 4, lines 3-6) reference reads, "date and time of last modification of one or more previous major updates. The one or more fields will inform the user of intermediate major updates between the last update the user downloaded and the current update." As shown earlier Greer (col. 7, lines 66-67) reads, "periodically (e.g., every fifth log-on, beginning of the month, etc.)".

Greer teaches that an update time can be determined from last modification time of a web page or by using the setup window to manually configure time parameters. *Greer does not in any way teach or suggest that an update time can automatically be created based only on the structure of an identifier such as a URL. In fact, Applicant can not find any mention of determining when to perform an update based on the URL in any of the cited references.*

However, Applicant does teach such automated configuration in application (Fig. 9, step 930,935) and page 22, lines 3-5, which reads, "The time may be *generated from the components of the identifier (e.g., identifier is a URI having a volume number and issue number as part of the URI).*" Furthermore Applicant (page 19, lines 10-25) *teaches how new URLs can periodically be generated based on configuration settings such as publishing interval* and the like.

III.   Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Applicant has carefully reviewed the references cited but not applied. Applicant respectfully submits that none of those references, alone or in any combination, remedy the deficiencies of the applied art, nor teach or suggest the claimed invention alone or in any combination.

IV.   Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the present application and pending claims 34-53, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a formal Notice of Allowance directed to claims 34-53, inclusive.

Should the Examiner believe that telephone correspondence would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

April 9, 2004

Eric Schneider

pro se Applicant

13938A Cedar Road #258

University Heights, Ohio 44118

(216) 231-2400 - telephone